

## REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited.

Claims 4 through 8 and 10 through 28 are pending, with Claims 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, and 21 being independent. Claims 5 through 8, 17, and 26 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1 through 3, 9, and 22 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 4, 10, 11, 21, and 25 have been amended.

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 5,913,081 (Okano, et al.). Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Okano, et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,955,208 (Wick, et al.). Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Kinugasa, et al. All rejections are respectfully traversed, and are submitted to have been mooted by the cancellation without prejudice of Claims 1 through 3 and 9.

Claims 4, 10, and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Okano, et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,060,074 (Kinugasa, et al.). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 4 recites, inter alia, effecting a correction during the image stabilizing operation being performed by the image stabilizing means, wherein in the correction the light quantity correcting means is controlled so as to vary a correction amount of light quantity among a plurality of pixels in the imaging area.

Claim 10 recites, inter alia, performing control during the correction of the shaking of the image being performed by the shake correcting means, the control comprising varying a full-open aperture diameter of the diaphragm according to a focal length.

Claim 11 recites, inter alia, controlling means for controlling a correction amount of light quantity among a plurality of pixels in the output imaging area during the image shaking operation being performed by the shake correcting means.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Okano, et al. nor Kinugasa, et al., even in the proposed combination, assuming, arguendo, that they could be combined, discloses or suggests at least the above-discussed claimed features as recited, inter alia, in Claims 4, 10, and 11. It is further respectfully submitted that there has been no showing of any indication of motivation in the cited documents that would lead one having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at such features.

Claims 12, 13, 18, 19, 21, 22, 27, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Okano, et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,311,238 (Karasawa, et al.). Claims 14, 15, 23, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Okano, et al. and Karasawa, et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,513,042 (Itoh, et al.). Claims 16 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Okano, et al., Karasawa, et al., and Itoh, et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,918,798 (Takano). Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Okano, et al. and Karasawa, et al. in view of Kinugasa, et al. All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 12 recites, inter alia, control means for controlling the first diaphragm to vary a full-open aperture diameter of the first diaphragm according to a focal length of said variable magnification lens during stabilizing of the image by the stabilizing means.

Claim 21 recites, inter alia, control means for controlling the first diaphragm to cause the first diaphragm to limit an on-axial light flux when the variable magnification lens is on a

telephoto side, wherein the control means provides a control to make the full-open aperture diameter of the diaphragm smaller when the variable magnification lens is on a telephoto side.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that none of Okano, et al., Karasawa, et al., Itoh, et al., Takano, and Kinugasa, et al., even in the proposed combinations, assuming, arguendo, that they could be combined, discloses or suggests at least the above-discussed claimed features as recited, inter alia, in Claims 12 and 21. With respect to Claim 12, Applicants respectfully submit that “full-open aperture diameter” is the maximum diameter, and Applicants have provided herewith an Exhibit comprising a printout regarding a lens from [www.photo.net/ezshop/product?product\\_id=3476](http://www.photo.net/ezshop/product?product_id=3476) that refers, inter alia, to “full open aperture diameter”. In Karasawa, et al., Applicants respectfully submit that Figs. 2 and 3 show, e.g., “Full-Aperture F Number” but Applicants respectfully submit that Karasawa, et al. fails to provide either a description or suggestion of at least the above-discussed claimed features. It is further respectfully submitted that there has been no showing of any indication of motivation in the cited documents that would lead one having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at such features.

The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable because they set forth additional aspects of the present invention and are dependent from independent claims discussed above. Therefore, separate and individual consideration of each dependent claim is respectfully requested.

Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Daniel S. Glueck", positioned above a horizontal line.

Daniel S. Glueck  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 37,838

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3800  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200  
DSG/cmg

DC\_MAIN 217320v1